

AGENDA

MULTI-AGENCY RADIATION SURVEY & SITE INVESTIGATION MANUAL (MARSSIM) WORKGROUP MEETING

September 27, 2004 (Monday)

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
1310 L Street, Conference Room 502
Washington, DC

- 0830 - 0845 Introductions, discussion of meeting agenda, and objectives
C. Petullo, Chair
- 0845 - 0930 Roundtable Status & Updates Relevant to MARSSIM
All Agencies
- 0930 - 1000 Administrative Issues - C. Petullo

Finalize minutes for 5/04 mtg.
ISCORS meeting October 28, 2004

Action Items from May 2004 meeting and Conference Calls:

C. Gogolak to provide a "sketch" which consists of a crosswalk featuring expanded items for discussion based on the conference calls.

R. Meck to provide English translation of Madrid measurement procedure for M&E that is based on MARSSIM- by Sept. 7, 2004 and put on the WG website.

1000 - 1015 Break/Caucus

1015 - 1130 Review of consensus and non-consensus issues from the MARSSIM vs. MARSAME Crosstalk Conference Calls on August 5 and 10, 2004:

- A) Not sure on results of discussion for Items 1 to 3.
- B) No. 4 - Consensus: Average is the most important thing. Too much attention is spent on hotspots.
- C) No. 5 - Consensus: MQC stays in and can include box and conveyor counters.
- D) No. 6 - Consensus: Need concept of MQC for scanning.
- E) No. 7 - Consensus: This is a LATER - Possible "Good Practices" Write-Up.
- F) No. 8 - Not sure of result.
- G) No. 9 - Consensus: Need Elipgrid/Risk Discussion
- H) No. 10 - Consensus: Swipes are not quantitative, but positive counts are indicators that radionuclides are present and can be used to ID which ones, at least for a partial list.

I) No. 11 - Consensus: Sentinel measurements are a component of Scoping w/the same logic as for swipes, but more is needed for Scoping.

AGENDA (Continued)

(MARSSIM)
WORKGROUP MEETING

September 27, 2004 (Monday)

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
1310 L Street, Conference Room 502
Washington, DC

- J) No. 12 - Consensus: For MARSAME we can use “CheckLists and SOPs” (unless a statistical sampling plan is needed)vs MARSSIM recommendation of formal documentation and survey design. However, formal documentation and survey designs ARE background information (boilerplate) for SOPs.
- K) No. 13 - Not sure of status of this point.
- L) No. 14 -
- Consensus: No addition of Class 0 for M&E
 - Consensus: May use process knowledge/bounding models to classify “inaccessible” parts or survey units
 - Non-Consensus/Issue: Can inaccessible areas ever be considered non-impacted in the MARSSIM sense of needing no measurements? If not, then even Class 3 will need to be taken apart at least partially. In response to this, Major Bias & R. Meck brought out a possible new form of Class 3 that combines process knowledge and biased sampling locations, eliminating the need for random sampling locations.
 - Non-consensus: Pivotal discussion needed here - Can a complex object be classified when the outside needs measurement and the inside does not? It simply will not make sense to dismantle a complex object in order to classify it.
- M) No. 15 (General overview: consensus on approaches presented in sub-points 1-4 - no consensus on sub-point 5 for Class 1 surveys. Note - we may not want to proceed w/sub-point 5 Class 1 survey - core consensus issue of great importance)
- Non-consensus: Do we still need to quantify even if all the measurements are less than the $DCGL_{ME}$?
 - Consensus: How to lower the MQC w/Static Measurements .
 - Non-consensus: If scan $MDC > DCGL_{ME}$, not able to do anything of use unless there is an Area Factor available to get a $DCGL_{ME-emc}$. C. Gogolak suggested making the Area Factor = 1 to solve this problem.
 - Consensus: MARSAME needs to provide alternative survey guidance on situations where survey methods (e.g., grid surveying of sharp objects) presents other (i.e., safety) hazards.
 - Non-consensus: Use of systematic grid surveying
- N) No. 16 - Consensus: If elevated hits on a scan, segregate/remove/clean and move on.
- O) No. 17 - Consensus: Regarding the statement the scan sensitivity in 17 must be the same as in #15.
- Non-consensus - How to determine a quantifiable number of static measurement locations to use in MARSAME. How do we defend our selected method and validate our choice as being conservative enough. How does the WG proceed on this issue?

AGENDA (Continued)

MULTI-AGENCY RADIATION SURVEY & SITE INVESTIGATION MANUAL
(MARSSIM)
WORKGROUP MEETING

September 27, 2004 (Monday)

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
1310 L Street, Conference Room 502
Washington, DC

- P) No. 18 - Non-Consensus: Any hits above $DCGL_{ME}$ would mean mis-classification and trigger review of the entire site classification. R. Meck suggested that gradation may be called for versus comprehensive review of the entire site.
- Q) No. 19 - Deferred until September meeting.
What to do for Class 3 Surveys?
- R) No. 20 - Deferred until September meeting.
Any “significant” hits mean mis-classification, & may trigger review of entire site classification process. Again, R. Meck suggested gradation may be called for versus comprehensive review of the entire site.
- 1130 - 1200 Public Comment Period
- 1200 - 1300 Lunch
- 1300 - 1500 Review and come to conclusion on consensus and non-consensus issues from the MARSSIM vs. MARSAME Crosstalk Conference Calls on August 5 and 10, 2004
- 1500 - 1515 Break/Caucus
- 1515 - 1700 Presentation on Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule-Making: Improving Radioactive Waste Management: EPA’s Low Activity Waste Effort - Dan Schultheisz, EPA/ORIA-HQ

AGENDA

MULTI-AGENCY RADIATION SURVEY & SITE INVESTIGATION MANUAL (MARSSIM) WORKGROUP MEETING

September 28, 2004 (Tuesday)

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
1310 L Street, Conference Room 502
Washington, DC

- 0830 - 0845 Introductions, discussion of meeting agenda & objectives - C. Petullo
- 0845 - 1015 Review and come to conclusion on consensus and non-consensus issues from the MARSSIM vs. MARSAME Crosstalk Conference Calls on August 5 and 10, 2004
- 1015 - 1030 Break/Caucus
- 1030 - 1130 Review and come to conclusion on consensus and non-consensus issues from the MARSSIM vs. MARSAME Crosstalk Conference Calls on August 5 and 10, 2004
- 1130 - 1200 Public Comment Period
- 1200 - 1300 Lunch
- 1300 - 1500 Review/Revise Draft MARSAME, Revision 7, Table of Contents - Scott Hay
(Note: Scott Hay will be hand carrying MARSAME Table of Contents to the meeting.)
- 1500 - 1515 Break/Caucus
- 1515 - 1700 Begin Review, Discussion and Finalization of Chapter 1, Revision 7 - Workgroup

* Contractors and members of the public will be asked to leave the meeting room for a brief period of time if the Workgroup needs to have business sensitive discussions involving future technical development work.

AGENDA
MULTI-AGENCY RADIATION SURVEY & SITE INVESTIGATION MANUAL
(MARSSIM)
WORKGROUP MEETING

September 29, 2004 (Wednesday)

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
1310 L Street, Conference Room 502
Washington, DC

- 0830 - 0845 Introductions, discussion of meeting agenda & objectives - C. Petullo
- 0845 - 1015 Conclude Review, Discussion and Finalization of Chapter 1, Revision 7 - Workgroup
- 1015 - 1030 Break/Caucus
- 1030 - 1130 Begin Review, Discussion and Finalize Chapter 3, Revision 7 - Workgroup
- 1130 - 1200 Public Comment
- 1200 - 1300 Lunch
- 1300 - 1445 Review, Discuss and Finalize Chapter 3, Revision 7 - Workgroup
- 1445 - 1500 Break/Caucus
- 1500 - 1700 Conclude Review, Discussion and Finalization of Chapter 3, Revision 7 - Workgroup

* Contractors and members of the public will be asked to leave the meeting room for a brief period of time if the Workgroup needs to have business sensitive discussions involving future technical development work.

AGENDA
MULTI-AGENCY RADIATION SURVEY & SITE INVESTIGATION MANUAL
(MARSSIM)
WORKGROUP MEETING

September 30, 2004 (Thursday)

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
1310 L Street, Conference Room 509
Washington, DC

- 0830 - 0845 Introductions, discussion of meeting agenda & objectives - C. Petullo
- 0845 - 1015 Begin Review/Comment and Discussion of Concrete Case Study -
Scott Hay & Nick Berliner, Cabrera Services - Contractor to Air Force
- 1015 - 1030 Break/Caucus
- 1030 - 1130 Review/Comment and Discussion of Concrete Case Study -
Scott Hay & Nick Berliner, Cabrera Services - Contractor to Air Force
- 1130 - 1200 Public Comment
- 1200 - 1300 Lunch
- 1300 - 1400 Conclude Concrete Case Study Review/Comment and Discussion
- 1400 - 1500 Review Glossary and provide comments or if WG chooses to discuss/comment on “Spanish
MARSAME” during this time, provide Glossary comments offline via emails/conference calls. -
Workgroup
- 1500 - 1515 Break/Caucus
- 1515 - 1600 Status of document development and meeting wrap up, next meeting deliverables, date, location
and agenda development - C. Petullo

* Contractors and members of the public will be asked to leave the meeting room for a brief period of time if the Workgroup needs to have business sensitive discussions involving future technical development work.

Scott Hay's Notes to WG

Note accompanying Chapter 3, Rev. 7:

Revision 7 of Chapter 3 is ready for review by the Workgroup. I tried to incorporate all of the comments from the May meeting and highlighted the majority of the text additions. Large portions of the discussions on radionuclides of concern and background radiation have been moved to Chapter 2 and Appendix B, respectively. Many of the Section titles have been updated to better describe the material. Section 3.4 on Classification has a major reorganization.

I encourage the reviewers to look at comments on Revision 5 of Chapter 3 dated May 7, 2004. Several comments were made that had an impact on several modifications that show up in Revision 7, including:

USAF Line 69, NRC/RES Line 92, NRC/RES Line 244, EPA/ORIA Line 246, US Navy Line 283, NRC/RES Line 508, NRC/RES Line 528, USAF Line 537, USAF Line 578, and EPA ORIA Line 590. I felt these comments were important for the rewrite, or may not have been adequately addressed because of deletions or reorganizations.

A question came up during the revision of Chapter 1 and Chapter 3. The second page of the flowchart in Chapter 1 discusses selection of measurement methods, which is also discussed in Section 3.5. This topic will be further discussed in the revision to Chapter 5. Please keep this in mind during the review.

Notes accompanying Concrete Example:

The first draft of the concrete example for the mineral processing facility is ready for review. The example was developed using Word, so there are some formatting differences that affect the line numbering and the appearance of the document. There are no line numbers inside the tables, so any comments on material in a table may require some description of what the comment refers to. I apologize for any inconvenience or confusion this may cause. We will try and get this resolved for future revisions and drafts.

This example covers the guidance provided in Chapters 2 and 3 of MARSAME. I think there are three major areas to be covered by the review:

First, does the structure match the guidance in Chapters 2 and 3, and is this the structure we want for the document and the remaining Case Study examples.

Second, does the breakdown of information between the IA and Information Sources work. Does this reflect the way the WG thinks people should design these surveys.

Third, is the information technically correct. There are a lot of calculations and a lot of assumptions that are included in this example, are there mistakes in the calculations or use of data.

I think improvements can be made in all three areas, and some others that I haven't thought of yet. There is a lot of information included in this example, but I think it helps to have a realistic example to help refine the guidance.

Directions to MARSSIM Workgroup Meeting

Take the Metro to the orange/blue line MacPherson Square Metro stop. Take the 14th Street exit. Facing 14th street, head to your left (north) for approximately two blocks to L Street. Turn right (east) and travel approximately ½ block to 1310 L Street. Take elevators to fifth floor, and head through the double glass doors. The 502 conference room is straight ahead, and the 509 conference room is down the hallway to your left.

Phone-in Information: The number for the 502 conference room phone is 202-343-9028 (not to be confused with my phone number 202-343-9228.) The number for 509 conference room is 202-343-9026. Up to two individuals can be conferenced in to the meeting through the phone - please let me know if you intend to call in.